REMARKS

Specification

Claim 13 has been amended to recite "a computer program which when executed an apparatus causes the apparatus to index content in an IP-based network". Applicant therefore submits that the specification provides sufficient antecedent basis for Claim 13.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claim 13 has been amended to recite "a computer program which when executed an apparatus causes the apparatus to index content in an IP-based network". Applicant therefore submits that Claim 13 complies with the requirements of 35 USC § 112.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a method of indexing location of content" as requested by the Examiner. Applicant therefore submits that Claim 1 complies with the requirements of 35 USC § 112.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Applicant notes that, in the instant Office Action, the Examiner has admitted that Colby "fails to teach intercepting data traffic flowing from a source node to a destination node in the network, the data intercepting data traffic flowing from a source node to a destination node in the network, the data traffic including content to be cached at the destination node and extracting identity information for the content and associated destination location information for the destination node where the content in the data traffic is to be cached from the data traffic flow".

Tucker is alleged by the Examiner to disclose these features. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Tucker discloses a method which is analogous to the method disclosed in Colby. In this method a request for information sent by a requestor is intercepted by a proxy server (see,

for example paragraph 36). The proxy server "forwards the request to the Redirector. The redirector checks to see if an edited compressed version of the content is available locally. If an edited and compressed version of the content is available locally then the URL is returned to the Proxy Server. The Proxy Server then fetches the URL from the Web Server's Cache and sends the edited and compressed content to the requester" (paragraph 36).

"In the event that the requested content is not locally available, the Redirector notifies the Proxy Server to obtain the URL from the source... the proxy server fetches the URL from the Internet Content Server on the Internet and returns the original unedited page to the Requestor" (paragraph 37). "The Editor [of the Proxy Server] gathers the image source URLs into a list along with their location and then submits them for compression at compressor... the Editor moves the edited and compressed URLs to the Web Server Cache" (paragraph 38).

Thus, it can be seen that the proxy server fetches and caches the URL. Applicant therefore submits that, as the URL is requested by and returned to the proxy server, there is no requirement for the proxy server in Tucker to intercept the URL. Hence, Applicant submits that Tucker does not disclose the steps of "intercepting data traffic flowing from a source node to a destination node [the proxy server] in the network, the data traffic including content to be cached at the destination node" (emphasis added) as recited in Claim 1.

Further, as the URL is transmitted to the proxy server for caching at the proxy server Applicant submits that there would be no need, on implementing the method of Tucker to perform the steps of "extracting identity information for the content and associated destination location information from the data traffic" and using the extracted information to generate a mapping which is stored in a content index database. Rather, the proxy server would allocate the cache and store the identity of the cache.

Applicant further submits that, although Tucker discloses intercepting a request at a proxy server, the request is not the equivalent of the data traffic recited in Claim 1. This is because the request cannot be considered to include content to be cached at the destination node for at least the same reasons as given in previous correspondence.

Hence, as neither Colby nor Tucker disclose the steps of "intercepting data traffic flowing from a source node to a destination node in the network, the data traffic including content to be cached at the destination node", "extracting identity information for the content and associated destination location information for the destination node", "generating a mapping from the content identified by the extracted identity information to the destination node identified by the associated destination location information", Applicant submits that Claim 1 would not have been obvious over Colby in view of Tucker.

Claims 8 and 13 have features corresponding to Claim 1 and Applicant therefore submits that, at least for the reasons given above with reference to Claim 1, Claim 8 and Claim 13 are patentable over Colby.

Claims 2 to 6 are submitted to be patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies.

Further and favorable reconsideration is urged.

Dated: April 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

William M. Lee, Jr.
Registration No. 26,935
Barnes & Thornburg
P.O. Box 2786
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786
(312) 214-4800
(312) 759-5646 (fax)

CHDS01 WLEE 461496v1